

### **Remarks**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed April 2, 2008.

#### **I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections**

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 8-12, and 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,374,271, hereafter Shimizu) in view of Newman et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,154,600, hereafter Newman) and further in view of Rutledge (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2004/0054627). Claims 23-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu in view of Newman and Rutledge and further and Efrat et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,570,587, hereafter Efrat).

#### **II. Summary of Applicants' Amendments**

The present Reply amends Claims 1, 3-4, 21, 23-24, and 31-32, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 8-12, and 19-32. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

#### **III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112**

In the Office Action, Claims 3, 23-24, and 31-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Accordingly, these claims have been amended as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims now comply with 35 U.S.C. 112 and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 31 and 32 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 for having insufficient antecedent basis for the term "the property editor tool." Applicant respectfully submits that antecedent basis exists for this term in both Claims 31 and 32 on line 5 of each claim which begins with "and a property editor tool." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims comply with 35 U.S.C. 112 and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **IV. Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 8-12, and 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu (U.S. Patent Number 6,374,271) in view of Newman (U.S. Patent Number 6,154,600) and further in view of Rutledge (U.S. Patent Publication

Number 2004/0054627). Claims 23-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu in view of Newman and Rutledge and further and Efrat (U.S. Patent Number 6,570,587).

#### **Claim 1**

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

1. *(Currently Amended) A computer-implemented method for processing media and configuring program properties associated with the media for a digital document, comprising:*
  - providing a collection basket tool interface for configuring program properties, the collection basket tool interface comprising a program basket workspace and an auxiliary workspace, wherein the program basket workspace comprises a plurality of program slots and the auxiliary workspace comprises at least one media configuration tool;*
  - receiving user input to select the media to import using the media configuration tool;*
  - importing the media selected by the user;*
  - generating at least one program that includes one or more program properties, wherein the one or more program properties are associated with the imported media and each program property is one of a common program property, a media related property, a synchronization property, an annotation property, a hotspot property, a narration property and a border property, wherein each program is a program object and each program property is a property object, and wherein each program object references at least one property object;*
  - creating a program element to represent each generated program, wherein each program element is displayed within a separate program slot of the program basket workspace; and*
  - editing the programs and properties based on user input obtained through the collection basket tool interface.*

Shimizu discloses a hypermedia authoring system that enables an author to generate a document using a goals outline and a presentation outline and provides a technique to relate the goals and the presentation outlines. The goals outline organizes the information content of the document contained in cards in a logical structure while the presentation outline is directed to a physical appearance of the document. (Column 1, lines 43-50). The cards in the card database 106 are information elements (called points) on which the document being authored is based. That is, the cards contain the actual hypermedia information such as video, sound or text that make up the document. (Column 3, lines 38-44; Figure 1).

Newman discloses a non-linear editing system for home audio and video applications including a compression/decompression engine, a high capacity storage device and a media

editor that provides point and click audio and video editing functionality, including recording, playback and special effects, such as real time fades, using a time-line system. (Abstract). Newman also discloses a graphics GUI that includes a graphics tab 492 having a scroll bar 494 and a plurality of icons 496 representing various graphic overlays, such as color, titles, and text on color. (Column 16, lines 21-25). Operation of the graphics editor is similar to conventional graphics editors, such as MacPaint and Paintbrush. (Column 16, lines 42-44).

Rutledge discloses a universal identification system for articles of printed and electronic media. (Abstract). The media ID software has a sophisticated graphical-user-interface (or GUI) 1086 that allows the user to navigate through locally stored IDs, initiate complicated search queries for local and remote media and media IDs, and retrieve articles of media and media IDs. (Paragraph [0275]).

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define generating at least one program that includes one or more program properties, wherein the one or more program properties are associated with the imported media. Claim 1 has also been amended to more clearly define that each program property is one of a common program property, a media related property, a synchronization property, an annotation property, a hotspot property, a narration property and a border property, wherein each program is a program object and each program property is a property object, and wherein each program object references at least one property object. Support for these amendments can be found in Applicant's Specification at paragraphs [0139] and [0171]. Applicant respectfully submits that Shimizu, in view of Newman and Rutledge, does not disclose or render obvious these features.

Shimizu appears to disclose linking cards with nodes in a goals outline and spacer objects in the bento-boxes. The cards contain the actual hypermedia information. In the embodiment of Claim 1, however, a program includes one or more program properties and the program properties are associated with the imported media. Shimizu only appears to disclose cards which contain *actual* hypermedia information, not properties associated with the imported media. Further, Shimizu does not appear to disclose generating at least one program that includes one or more program properties. Shimizu appears to disclose that a card can be created by the user, but because a card is defined as containing the actual hypermedia this appears to disclose creating hypermedia and not generating a program as defined in Claim 1.

Newman and Rutledge also do not appear to disclose programs and program properties as defined in Claim 1. As described above, Newman appears to disclose a media editor that enables a user to edit audio and video, the actual media information, using a GUI. Rutledge

appears to disclose a system for searching for media. Applicant respectfully submits that Shimizu, in view of Newman and Rutledge, does not disclose or render obvious generating at least one program that includes one or more program properties, wherein the one or more program properties are associated with the imported media.

Additionally, it was asserted that Shimizu discloses that each program object references at least one property object, as defined in Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Shimizu appears to disclose linking cards with spacer objects and goals outline nodes. As noted above, the cards contain the actual hypermedia information. Therefore, in Shimizu, nodes and spacers reference the actual hypermedia. In Claim 1, however, each program references at least one property object. Similarly, Newman and Rutledge do not appear to disclose that each program object references at least one property object. Applicant respectfully submits that Shimizu, in view of Newman and Rutledge, does not disclose or render obvious these features.

It was further asserted that Shimizu discloses editing the programs and properties based on user input obtained through the collection basket tool interface. Shimizu appears to disclose specifying spatial and temporal parameters corresponding to each spacer object. This appears to be implemented using a presentation outline processor which enables a user to arrange the spacer objects in a spatial layout area and to sequence the spacers using a temporal view. Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define that each program property is one of a common program property, a media related property, a synchronization property, an annotation property, a hotspot property, a narration property and a border property, wherein each program is a program object and each program property is a property object, and wherein each program object references at least one property object. Applicant respectfully submits that Shimizu does not disclose or render obvious this feature.

Newman appears to disclose a media editing system in which a user can capture hypermedia to a storyboard and then manipulate the captured hypermedia by adding graphics, text, and audio annotations. This is different from the embodiment of Claim 1, as amended. Whereas Newman appears to disclose importing hypermedia and making edits *directly* to the hypermedia, Claim 1 defines editing *the programs and properties* based on user input. In Claim 1, the imported media is not edited directly, instead programs and properties associated with the media are edited. As described above, Rutledge appears to disclose a search tool. Applicant respectfully submits that Shimizu, in view of Newman and Rutledge, does not disclose or render obvious the embodiment of Claim 1, as amended.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as currently amended, is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claims 31-32**

The comments provided above with respect to Claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. Claims 31-32 have been amended similarly to Claim 1. For similar reasons as provided above for Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 31-32 are similarly neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claims 3-4, 6, 8-12, and 19-30**

Claims 3-4, 6, 8-12, and 19-30 are not addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the amendments to the independent claim, and the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that these Claims are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 25, 2008

By: /Nathan L. Feld/  
Nathan L. Feld  
Reg. No. 59,725

Customer No. 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800